

REMARKS

Claims 35-64 and 92-108 were pending in the application at the time of the Office Action. Claim 55 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for having a term that lacked antecedent basis. Applicant has herein amended claim 55 to address the rejection. Claim 64 was rejected on grounds that it was “unclear what structure the language in claim 64 describes.” One embodiment of the structure described in claim 64 is depicted in Figure 23 of the application as originally filed. Applicant submits that the claim language is definite and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 35-42, 44, 48-50, 55-57, and 64 were rejected as being anticipated by and/or obvious over cited art. Claims 43, 45-47, 51-54, 58-63, 94-103 and 108 were objected to in the Office Action as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but were asserted to be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this response applicant has amended claim 35 to incorporate the limitations of claim 46 which depended directly therefrom. As such, applicant submits that claim 35 is allowable for the same reasons that claim 46 was considered allowable in the Office Action. Claims 43 and 46 have been cancelled and claims 45 and 47 have been amended to be consistent with amended claim 35. Claims 36-42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 102, and 103 depend from claim 35 and thus incorporate the limitations thereof. As such, claims 36-42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 102, and 103 are also allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 35.

Applicant has amended claim 49 to incorporate the limitations of claim 59 which depended directly therefrom. As such, applicant submits that claim 49 is allowable for the same reasons that claim 59 was considered allowable in the Office Action. Claim 59 has been

cancelled. Claims 50-58, 60-64, and 108 depend from claim 49 and thus incorporate the limitations thereof. As such, claims 50-58, 60-64, and 108 are also allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 49.

Claims 92, 93, and 104-107 were allowed in the Office Action and thus are not discussed herein.

New claim 109 is the combination of claims 35 and 43. As such, applicant submits that claim 109 is allowable for the same reasons that claim 43 was considered allowable in the Office Action. New claim 110 is the combination of claims 49 and 51. As such, applicant submits that claim 110 is allowable for the same reasons that claim 51 was considered allowable in the Office Action. New claim 111 is the combination of claims 49 and 60. As such, applicant submits that claim 111 is allowable for the same reasons that claim 60 was considered allowable in the Office Action.

No other objections or rejections are set forth in the Office Action.

Applicant notes that this response does not discuss every reason why the claims of the present application are distinguished over the cited art. Most notably, applicant submits that many if not all of the dependent claims are independently distinguishable over the cited art. Applicant has merely submitted those arguments which it considers sufficient to clearly distinguish the claims over the cited art.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration and allowance of claims 35-42, 44-45, 47-58, 60-64, and 92-111 as amended and presented herein.

In the event there remains any impediment to allowance of the claims which could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Dated this 9th day of December 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dana L. Tangren/ Reg # 37246
DANA L. TANGREN

Registration No. 37,246
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone No. 801.533.9800

DLT:saw:dfw

C:\NRPORTBL\DMST\DWILSON\2195758_1.DOC